

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are currently pending in the application, with claims 1, 12, 14, and 20 being independent. Claims 8, 13, and 21 were withdrawn from further consideration as being drawn to a non-elected species according to Applicant's election filed May 17, 2004. Claim 17 was withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner as also being directed to a non-elected species. Applicant has amended claims 1, 4, 5, 12, 14, and 20 to correct minor informalities as required by the Examiner. Applicant also added new claims 22-24 to present alternative aspects of the invention.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for extending the courtesy of a personal interview on October 26, 2004. During the interview, Applicant's representatives explained the invention and distinguished the claims from the prior art. The Examiner indicated the outstanding rejection based on Tanaka (U. S. Patent No. 5,253,338) would be withdrawn and the search would be updated for the next Office Action.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claims 1-7, 9-12, 14-16, 18-20 due to a number of informalities. Applicant has amended the claims to correct these informalities and therefore respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw these claim objections.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §103

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, 10, 12, 14, 16, and 18-20 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over USP 6,567,120 B1 to Hamamura et al. ("Hamamura") in view of USP 5,253,338 Tanaka ("Tanaka").

Hamamura discloses an information processing apparatus which provides a photographic mode in which objects are photographed and a memo input mode in which memo information such as line images is input from a position information input device (Column 1, lines 13-19.) The information processing apparatus includes a mode selection unit which selects a photographic mode and a memo input mode. A control unit controls the mode selection. A detection unit detects whether input has occurred based on a position information input device. In the event that the detection unit detects the occurrence of input from the position information input device, and provided the photographic mode is selected by the mode selection unit, the control unit controls the mode selection unit so as to cause it to select the memo and input mode (Column 1, lines 57-67.) Hamamura further discloses an image acquisition apparatus whereby an image is acquired through lens 3 and diaphragm 54 by CCD sensor 20. Subsequent processing is performed on the image by DSP 33 and the image is subsequently stored in frame memory 35. (See column 5, line 65 through column 6, line 35.)

Image data stored in frame memory 3 may be expanded and displayed on LCD 6 (Column 6, lines 28-32.)

However, as admitted by the Examiner (Office Action: page 4, lines 3-6), Hamamura fails to teach or suggest, at least, "causing the display control device to retrieve the stored information and display a portion of the image represented by the stored information as a main image on the display panel," as recited in claims 1 and 12.

Tanaka fails to cure the deficiencies of Hamamura in this respect. Tanaka merely teaches a semi-automatic image tracing method for graphics and processing devices, in which image points of the image data are traced in a semi automatic fashion and a switch control is arranged to continue the tracing upon a decision made on the trace conditions at a branch point of the tracing path, thereby tracing the image points of the image data while confirming the tracing path. (See column 2, lines 25-33.) In the graphics processor, the trace processing for the image starts upon the designation for tracing and implements tracing the image points according to the tracing conditions set in the control data parameter table, and is caused to be interrupted at every branch point of the tracing path at which the designation by the operator is required during the trace processing. As the trace processing is interrupted, the image data in the neighborhood of the branch point is enlarged and displayed by the branch point neighborhood

display processing section to thereby wait for the designation for tracing from the operator to be made next, and the trace processing is continued upon the next designation for tracking. (See column 2, line 65 through column 3, line 10.) In order to allow the operator to readily input the designation for selecting the tracing path, the branch point neighborhood display processing unit is configured to enlarge and display the neighborhood in the vicinity of the branch point on an auxiliary view port disposed separately from the main view port for displaying the whole area of the tracing path. (Column 3, lines 15-22.) In Figure 5, Tanaka further teaches an alternate method of display use for the semi-automatic trace processing. Here, Tanaka teaches using the auxiliary view port 46, which is embedded in the main display 42, to display the position in the vicinity of the branch point whereby the neighborhood of which is displayed in an enlarged fashion. (See column 7, lines 51-55.)

Therefore, Tanaka also fails to teach, at least, a display control device which displays a portion of the image represented by the stored information as a main image on the display," as recited in claims 1 and 12.

As noted in Figure 5, Tanaka discloses the main display 42 displaying the entire image, while the sub-display 46 displays only a portion of the image in an enlarged format. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the

§103(a) rejections of claims 1 and 12. Claims 2-11 depend from allowable claim 1 and are allowable by virtue of their dependency. Claims 14 and 20 include recitations similar to claims 1 and 12 and are therefore allowable at least for the reasons provided above for the allowability of claims 1 and 12. Claims 15-19 depend from allowable claim 14 and are also allowable by virtue of their dependency. Claim 21 depends from allowable claim 20 and is also allowable by virtue of its dependency.

The Examiner rejected claims 4 and 15 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamamura in view of Tanaka and further in view of USP 5,589,960 to Chiba et al. ("Chiba"). Claims 4 and 15 depend from allowable claims 1 and 14, respectfully and as such include all of the recitations recited therein. Chiba fails to cure the deficiencies of Hamamura and Tanaka as presented above in the arguments for the allowable claims 1 and 14. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the §103(a) rejections of claims 4 and 15.

The Examiner rejected claim 11 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamamura in view of Tanaka and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0024608 A1 to Ejima et al. ("Ejima").

Claim 11 depends from allowable claim 1 and therefore includes all of the recitations recited therein. Ejima fails to cure the deficiencies of Hamamura and Tanaka as provided in the arguments

for allowable claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the §103 rejection of claim 11.


Conclusion


Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 
D. Richard Anderson, #40,439


DRA/JAV/jeb/slb
1982-0155P

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

(Rev. 02/12/2004)